

#### STATE OF WASHINGTON

#### WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

1300 S. Evergreen Park Dr. S.W., P.O. Box 47250 • Olympia, Washington 98504-7250 (360) 664-1160 • TTY (360) 586-8203

October 8,2002

RECEIVED

OCT 2 3 2002

Ms. Marlene H. Dortch Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> St. S.W. Washington, D.C. 20554

RE: Ex-Parte Disclosure

Letter to Chairman Powell Concerning M&L Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Skyline Telephone Company Petition for Waiver of Sections 36.611. 36.612 and 69.2(hh) of FCC Rules, CC Docket No. 96-15

Dear Secretary Dortch:

The Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission submitted the attached Ex-Parte filing concerning the petition of M&L Enterprises, Inc. d/b/a Skyline Telephone Company Petition for Waiver of Sections 36.611. 36.612 and 69.2(hh) of FCC Rules, CC Docket No. 96-45, to Chairman Powell on October 7, 2002. Two copies of the filing are attached.

In addition to Chairman Powell, copies of the **Ex-Parte** filing addressed to Chairman Powell **were** provided to:

\_11<del>//</del>28≥.

Christopher Libertelli, Office of the Chairman William Maher, Chief, Wireline Competition **Bureau** 

Thanklum

Sincerely,

CAROLE J. WASHBURN

Executive Secretary

V FU (6)



#### STATE OF WASHINGTON

#### WASHINCTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

1300 5. Evergreen Park Dr. S.W., P.O. Box 47250 • Olympia, Washington 98504-7250 (360) 664-1160 • TTY (360) 586-8203

October 7, 2002

Honorable Michael K. Powell Chairman Federal Communications Commission 445 12<sup>th</sup> St. S.W. Washington, D.C. **20554** 

Re: M&L Enterprises, Iuc. d/b/a Skyline Telephone Company Petition for Waiver of Sections 36.611. 36.612 and 69.2(hh) of FCC Rules CC Docket No. 96-45 Ex-Parte

### Dear Chairman Powell:

We write to request you take immediate action on the May 25, 2001, petition of Skyline Telephone for participation in the federal high-cost fund and the National Exchange Carrier Association's (NECA's) interstate access tariffs and pools. Immediate action on this petition is necessary to prevent the cessation of telephone service to approximately 115 households in Washington. Cessation of tslephoae service will occur when Skyline can no longer need its loan commitments, something it cannot do without universal service support and interstate access revenues. Cessation of telephone service to these homes (which have only had service for a little over a year) would be a travesty that would jeopardize public safety and leave many households without access to any form of telecommunications other than a five-mile drive to a pay telephone.'

Skyliiie Telephone began service in the Mt. Hull area of north-central Washington in 2001. Mt. Hull is an area northeast of the town of Tonasket, in Okanogan County. Okanogan County is one of the most mountainous, rural, and economically depressed counties in Washington. Skyline provides service to an area where people never previously had telephone service.

In the absence of universal service support and interstate access revenue, the company would have to charge customers in excess of \$140.00 per month to avoid ceasing service. It is not reasonable to expect that all 115 customers would, or could, yay that amount, and we are convinced that customers will lose service.

Letter to Honorable Michael K. Powell October 7, 2002 Page 2

Skyline established an exchange in an area where there had never been telephone service and where there was no telephone plant or equipment, notwithstanding that the area had been located for administrative purposes within the study areas of Qwest and Verizon. Because the unserved area had once been situated in two study areas, the FCC's Wireline Competition Bureau staff is apparently concerned that providing federal universal service support for this location will have an adverse effect upon federal universal service policy. The Bureau staff's concern is misplaced and its decision not to act on the petition for over 16 months is producing an effect that will be wholly contrary to the universal service goals of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

The Telecommunications Act of 1996 does not contemplate the exclusive ownership or franchise of locations. Moreover, under Washington law, any telecommunications carrier may operate in any location because there can be no exclusive territory. Even if Skyline had wanted to purchase pan of the Qwest and Verizon study areas, it could not have done so because neither Qwest nor Verizon had anything to sell. This is different from the sale of plant and equipment, which is properly regulated by both the Washington Commission and the FCC. In the case of Mt. Hull, there was no plant or equipment because the area had never been served by Qwest, Verizon or any other carrier.

The Bureau's concern is also misplaced because Skyline's creation of an exchange was not a sale of an exchange from a non-rural carrier to a rural carrier that may result in the limitation or denial of universal service support under FCC rules. Rather, Skyline constructed and established an exchange of its **own**, without any purchase of assets or territory from Qwest or Verizon, and installed the first telecommunications plant and equipment the **area has** ever known.

The Act does require designation of geographic service areas for purposes of determining eligibility for high-cost support. We have designated Skyline as an eligible telecommunications carrier (ETC) for the Mt. Hull exchange. We have never designated Qwest as an ETC for its study area that includes the Mt. Hull area. (Qwest receives no high-cost fund support from the FCC to support its service in rural Washington.) Whereas we have designated Verizon as an ETC for the Tonasket exchange, Verizon altered the boundaries of its Tonasket exchange in 2001, and is not an ETC for any part of the Mt. Hull exchange. Because we have designated Skyline an ETC for the Mt. Hull exchange, it should he cligible to receive federal universal service support. (Skyline participates in the state universal service mechanism, but that does not provide sufficient support to maintain the company, just as the state mechanism alone does not provide sufficient support for CenturyTel, Sprint/United, TDS, and Verizon, for example.)

We also understand from Bureau staff that part of its concern may be related to the recent growth and overall size of the universal service fund. These nationwide concerns should he addressed in a gena-al rulemaking, and are not an appropriate reason to delay

Letter to Honorable Michael K. Powell October 7. 2002 Page 3

or deny the benefits of support to approximately 115 households in one of the most mountainous, rural, and economically depressed counties in Washingtoii. If Skyline does not soon receive federal universal service support and interstate access revenues, it will have no choice hut to temiinate its service to those households.

The Skyline petition has languished for over sixteen months. Any more delay may preclude, as a practical matter; effective relief for Skyline. To reiterate, Skyline informs us that in a short time it will not be in a position to meet its loan commitments. In the interest of the 115 households served by Skyline, we request that you take immediate action and grant the petition.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Chairwonian Commissioner

Commissioner

Enclosure: Skyline Telephone Profit and Loss Statement

Honorable Patty Murray, United States Senator
Honorable Mana Cantwell, United States Senator
Honorable George Nethercutt, Member of Congress

MIDVALE TELEPHON

208 355 2222

₽.∃ Ø1006

#### LARRY A. JEFFRIES C.P.A.

TRAVIS JEFFRIES, P A **CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS** 1177 Wast State Street Bolse, Idaho 83702

(208) 345-5383 FAX (208) 345-6505 EMAIL: Larry@travis-jeffries.com

September 25, 2002

Karen Williams Skyline Telephone Company Midvale. Idaho

Dear Karen:

Enclosed is the Compiled Profit and Loss -Telephone Operations for Skyline for the first six months of this year. It shows an operating loss of \$61,298. When you add this to the \$109,741 loss for the 2001 year your cumulative bss is \$171,039. From our discussions It does not appear the balance of the 2002 year will be much improved.

Monies to support these sustained losses have come from borrowing from stockholders. It is important at this point to review your revenue structure and projections for the near future. It does not appear that the Company can continue telephone operations and incur these losses.

I will be available to discuss this statement in more detall after you have reviewed it.

Very truly yours,

Larry

Larry A. Jeffries Certified Public Accountant OBERATING DEVENUE

-Ø 007 **p.4** 

# **Skyline Telephone Company** PROFIT AND LOSS - TELEPHONE OPERATIONS

For the Six Months Ended June 30,2002

OPERATING REVENUE	
Basic local network services	\$ 17,047.91
Network access services	29,619.51
Total Operating Ravenues	46,667.42
OPERATING EXPENSES	
Plant specific operations	21,743.63
Plant nonspecific operations	2,474,60
Customer operations	3,637.66
Corporate operations	38,202.17
Depreciation and amortization	<u>29,435.42</u>
Total Operating Expenses	96,693.48
OPERATING EXPENSES	
Other operating taxes	70.00
Operating Income (loss)	(49,096.06)
FIXED CHARGES	
interest on debt	14,671.91
	(63,767.97)
OTHER INCOME	4
Gain on sale of assets	2,470.00
Net Income (Loss) From Telephone Operations	\$ (61,297.97)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

**208** 355 2222

## LARRY A. JEFFRIES C.P.A.

TRAVIS JEFFRIES, P A CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS 1177 West State Street Boise, Idaho 83702

> (208) 345-5383 FAX (208) 345-5505 EMAIL: bery@travis-jeffries.com

**September 25,2002** 

Karen Williams **Skyline Telephone Company** Midvale, Idaho

Dear Karen:

Enclosed is the Compiled Profit and Loss - Telephone Operations for Skyline for the first six months of this year. It shows an operating loss of \$61,298. When you add this to the \$109,741 loss for the 2001 year your cumulative loss is \$171.039. From our discussions it does not appear the balance of the 2002 year will be much Improved.

Monies to support these sustained losses have come from borrowing from stockholders. It is important at this point to review your revenue structure and projections for the near future. It does not appear that the Company can continue telephone operations and incur these losses.

I will be available to discuss this statement in more detail after you have reviewed it.

Very truly yours.

Larry

Larry A. Jeffries **Certified Public Accountant**  р.3

**Skyline Telephone** Company PROFIT AND LOSS - TELEPHONE OPERATIONS

For the Six Months Ended June 30, 2002

OPERATING REVENUE	
Basic local network services	\$ 17,047.91
Network access services	29,619.51
Total Operating Revenues	46,667.42
OPERATING EXPENSES	
Plant specific operations	21,743.83
Plant nonspecific operations	2 <b>,474.50</b>
Customer operations	3,837.66
Corporate operations	38,292.17
Depreciation and amortization	29,435.42
Total Operating Expenses	95,693.48
OPERATING EXPENSES	
Other operating taxes	70.00
Operating income (loss)	(49,096.08)
FIXED CHARGES	
Interest on debt	14,671.91 (63,767.97)
OTHER INCOME	
Gain on sale of assets	2,470.00

Net Income (Loss) From Telephone Operations